

Governor’s Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation (LCI)
Integrated Climate Adaptation and Resiliency Program (ICARP)
Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

March 6, 2026

SUMMARY

TAC Members Present:

- Abby Edwards, LCI
- Jacob Alvarez¹, City of Coachella
- Alex Ghenis, Accessible Climate Strategies
- Kim Clark, Southern California Association of Governments
- Jonathan Parfrey, Climate Resolve
- Linda Helland, California Department of Public Health (CDPH)
- Clare Winterton, The Solutions Project²
- John Wentworth, Town of Mammoth Lakes
- Jaylen Tran, California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA)
- Patrick Moore, Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E)
- Nayamin Martinez, Central California Environmental Justice Network
- Julia Kingsley, California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA)
- Robyn Fennig, California Office of Emergency Services
- Molly Oshun, Sonoma County Water Agency
- Jenn Phillips, California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA)
- Sarah Izant, California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA)
- Virginia Jameson, California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA)
- Denise Kadara, Allensworth Progressive Association
- David Loya, City of Arcata
- Roberto Carlos Torres, City and County of San Francisco

TAC Members Absent:

- Michelle Passero, The Nature Conservancy (TNC)

Roll Call & Housekeeping

Sam Magill, Sacramento State University College of Continuing Education, discussed meeting logistics for in person and online attendees. Sierra Woodruff, LCI conducted a roll call. With 19 members present, a quorum was reached, and the meeting was called to order.

Abby Edwards, TAC Chair, reviewed the agenda.

Approval of Draft Meeting Minutes

Magill led discussion and approval of the October 24, 2025, TAC meeting minutes. After a brief introduction, the following conversation was recorded:

¹ Participated remotely; location publicly accessible in compliance with the Bagley Keene Open Meetings Act

² Alternate for Gloria Walton, The Solutions Project

- Jonathan Parfrey noted the minutes should reflect the location of the meeting at Hyatt Place in Delano, California. Parfrey also commented the word “adjourn” on page 8 was misspelled.
- Roberto Carlos Torres requested his name be corrected.

Public Comment

None.

Parfrey made a motion to approve the October 24, 2025, meeting minutes. Nayamin Martinez seconded. With 16 ayes, 0 notes, and 4 abstentions, the minutes were approved as amended.

Aye: Abby Edwards, Kim Clark, Alex Ghenis, Jen Phillips, Sarah Izant, Virginia Jameson, Denise Kadara, David Loya, Nayamin Martinez, Julia Kingsley, Robyn Fennig, Jonathan Parfrey, Linda Helland, Robert-Carlos Torres, John Wentworth, Jacob Alvarez

No: None.

Abstain: Jacob Alvarez, Patrick Moore, Claire Winterton, Molly Oshun

TAC Member Report Out

Edwards announced two new members would be joining the TAC: Molly Oshun from Sonoma County Water Agency and Julia Kingsley representing CalSTA. Kingsley was appointed as the CalSTA Deputy Secretary for Environmental Policy and Housing Coordination by the Governor in December 2025. In this role, Julia will focus on initiatives related to reducing vehicle miles traveled, housing and transportation coordination, and climate resilience. Oshun serves as the Climate Resilience Engineer at Sonoma County Water Agency, focusing on climate adaptation for drinking water, flood protection, and sanitation systems.

ICARP Programmatic Updates and Staff Report

Edwards provided ICARP programmatic updates, beginning with new staff including:

- Sarah Yen, Executive Fellow
- Angelo Resayo, Assistant Adaptation and Resilience Planner
- Nikka Malakooti, California Council on Science and Technology Fellow

Following updates on new staff, Woodruff provided additional programmatic updates:

- The Adaptation Planning Grant Program (APGP) round 1 closed, marking the completion of the APGP.
- 16 Regional Resilience Planning and Implementation Grant Program projects have been awarded since 2023, totaling \$21.8 million. These projects are now more than 50% complete.
- Round 2 of the Extreme Heat and Community Resilience Program will be released in Spring 2026 with applications due in the Summer.
- The Climate Services team at ICARP is expanding direct technical assistance.
- California’s 5th Climate Change Assessment is currently under review with rollout expected in the Summer of 2026.
- ICARP is working with key partners to launch the Resilience California Summit in October.
- The update of the report “Defining Vulnerable Communities in the Context of Climate Adaptation” is underway and includes updates to the definition of vulnerable communities amended by the TAC in 2025. TAC members will have until Monday, March 9th to provide additional comments; the Report will be finalized for public release following the comment deadline.

Discussion

Edwards led a discussion session with TAC members on the updates provided above. The input and questions received are as follows; chair/staff responses are provided below as sub-bullets:

- Parfrey noted the Resilience California Summit will be held at the Sacramento Convention Center on October 20th, 2026.
- Jacob Alvarez noted the items on the staff report should reflect the same numbering on the agenda in future meetings.

Adapting to Loss of Federal Funding

Edwards opened the item by noting that since January 2025, hundreds of millions of dollars in Federal funding for mitigation, resilience, and preparedness have been cut, withdrawn, or cancelled, significantly impacting California. These changes require a shift from grant funding to financing models that incentivize risk reduction and resilience with new partnerships. ICARP and the TAC will investigate these opportunities throughout 2026.

Following opening remarks, Dr. Lily Bui, director of climate and disaster preparedness and resilience at SoCal Grantmakers presented how federal changes affect LA fire recovery:

- The 2025 LA fires destroyed 13,000 structures and caused 31 fatalities. Unlike previous large fires, this event crossed multiple jurisdictional boundaries as an urban conflagration, resulting in overlapping governance and decision-making challenges.
- Reductions in federal spending created huge uncertainty in long-term support to recovery and resilience activities. It's unclear if future federal appropriations will include funding for recovery such as the Community Development Block Grant Disaster Recovery (CDBG-DR) through the Housing and Urban Development Agency.
- Key trends and lessons learned for disaster philanthropy include:
 - Recovery from wildfires tends to be the most complex and most expensive part of the disaster cycles but is generally underfunded by philanthropy.
 - Philanthropy provided \$1.7 billion for all disasters *across the entire country* in 2024. \$860-\$970 million in charitable giving has been raised for the LA fire, a small fraction of the total amount needed.
 - Philanthropy is one of several stakeholders involved in financial risk for disaster recovery. Public financing covers the largest share of recovery costs, but as noted, is increasingly uncertain. The private sector also absorbs a lot of loss through insurance, payouts from utilities may be available for some disasters, and banks providing lending instruments to help rebuild.
- Three long-term recovery groups were established for direct service and disaster resilience in the LA area, including the Eaton Fire Collaborative, PaliLTRG, and the Malibu Long-Term Recovery Group. Funding for these organizations is uncertain after 2026, leaving many survivors uncertain about what their pathway for recovery looks like.
- A large percentage of insurance payouts to private homeowners are being used for daily living expenses instead of rebuilding. Mental health issues have also increased for survivors.
- New funding models are needed to sustain long-term recovery and rebuilding resulting in program-related investments, recoverable grants, and public-private partnerships. These capital needs will increase over time.

Following Bui's presentation, JR Rogers, Napa County Fire Administrator, provided a presentation on Napa County's 2022 Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities (BRIC) Grant for strategic fire resilience initiatives. Rogers noted that about a year into implementing the BRIC grant, Napa County received notice on April 4, 2025, this federal program was cancelled. The BRIC grant was intended to cover fuels reduction projects and home hardening (cost-shared with the county). To backfill the \$50 million shortfall, Napa County is applying for a Hazard Grant Mitigation Program (HGMP) grant and partnering with the Napa County Firewise Foundation to seek other sources of funding. A local .5 cent sales tax to support open space and fuels reduction will also be on the ballot in November 2026.

Michael Bessette, Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency (SBFCA) Executive Director, provided a presentation on the Sutter Bypass East Levee improvements to provide 100-year flood protection for the lower Feather River basin. SBFCA received notice in July 2024 that the project was selected for BRIC funding; the BRIC grant was cancelled in 2025 after the local agency had already invested \$5 million on project design. As a result, SBFCA is now pivoting to a potential HGMP grant under FEMA with submittal in the Spring of 2026 and potential state funding opportunities.

Danielle Mieler, City of Alameda Sustainability and Resilience Manager, provided a presentation on recent efforts to mitigate flood risk and sea level rise in the City. The Oakland Alameda Adaptation Committee was formed in 2021 to coordinate flood and sea level rise adaptation efforts in the immediate region; an early focus of the Committee looked at multi-jurisdiction projects in the Bay Farm Island area adjacent to Oakland, Alameda, and the Oakland San Francisco Bay International Airport. This area was identified as a priority flooding area, with depths of three feet or more under many climate change/sea level rise scenarios. Recent king tide events in 2026 inundated several areas of Bay Farm Island, including a state route access road to the Airport and pedestrian/bike bridges. The project was submitted for a BRIC grant in 2024 with a favorable outlook; funding from BRIC was cancelled in 2025. As a result of the cancellation, portions of the project are moving forward with cross-jurisdictional support in a more piecemeal fashion. Although small projects have received funding from the cities and State, roughly 90% of the total project cost of \$290 million remains unfunded.

Discussion

Edwards led a discussion session with TAC members on the funding updates listed above. The input and questions received are as follows; chair/staff responses are provided below as sub-bullets:

- Robyn Fennig noted CalOES is working closely with the California Attorney General's Office to determine next steps. In Massachusetts, a district court recently ruled in favor of the state directing FEMA to implement programs and grants. Since then, 20 states, including California, have filed suits to require the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to fulfill its obligations. By late March, each state is supposed to receive notifications about BRIC grants. Within 21 days, FEMA is required to issue the 2024 BRIC Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) again. Although this is a positive development, confusion at the federal level persists for the 28 California projects with previously obligated BRIC funding. Additional updates will be provided at the next TAC quarterly meeting.
- Parfrey asked if the Napa community sales tax initiative would be approved by the Board of Supervisors or on the ballot for voter approval in November.
 - Rogers confirmed it will be on the ballot in November but noted it may require California Legislature approval to exceed current sales tax maximums.
- John Wentworth stressed the importance of using accurate language to reflect the current administration's actions. He also reiterated the need for citizen-led coalitions to create statewide investment strategies utilizing all available funding sources.

- Claire Winterton asked what the primary focus of philanthropic organizations should be for disaster recovery efforts.
 - Bui responded that ideally, philanthropic organizations would organize around strategies like the National Disaster Recovery Framework. Initial philanthropic response should focus on housing an infrastructure, infrastructure, and economic recovery. Philanthropy has historically been risk averse regarding infrastructure investment.
- Nayamin Martinez noted citizen led tax initiatives can be helpful to bridge funding gaps in the current climate.
 - Mieler responded a tax initiative is also under consideration for the November 2026 ballot in Alameda, but all funding options are on the table.
- Ghenis noted vulnerable populations and people with disabilities are generally under-resourced and asked if any of the local efforts are focused on serving these populations specifically.
 - Bui responded some foundations are focused on providing support for older adults and individuals with access and functional needs. Philanthropy can serve very niche needs for specific populations, but sustainable funding from local and state governments is still needed for response, recovery, and long-term resilience.
- Fennig said for individuals who received individual assistance in 2025, and insurance benefits are running out, they can now go back and get rental assistance through FEMA programs.

Update on Climate Bond (Proposition 4)

Edwards introduced Julie Alvis and Clesi Bennett from CNRA to discuss the Climate Bond, also known as Proposition 4. Alvis provided an overview of Proposition 4, a \$10 billion bond measure approved by voters in 2024 to protect communities and nature from climate hazards. Proposition 4 will be rolled out over time through Budget Act appropriations. Specific programs and priorities funding by Proposition 4 will include:

- \$3.8 billion for water quality, drinking water, flood protection, and drought resilience
- \$1.5 billion for wildfire protection and resilience
- \$1.2 billion for coast protection and resilience
- \$450 million for extreme heat mitigation
- \$1.2 billion for biodiversity and nature-based solutions
- \$300 million for climate-smart agriculture investments
- \$700 million for park creation and outdoor access
- \$850 million for clear air/energy

\$3.3 billion was appropriated in the 2024/25 Budget Act and is now authorized for rollout across the programs and priorities listed above. An additional \$2.1 billion is included in the Governor’s proposed 2026/27 Budget. Generally, projects funded by Proposition 4 are expected to make strategic, multi-benefit investments. Projects are expected to be coordinated with other entities where possible. Additionally, Proposition 4 seeks to improve access to funds for historically underserved areas and populations by using easy-to-understand language and improving outreach. More information on Proposition 4 is available at https://bondaccountability.resources.ca.gov/Propositions/Proposition_4_Climate_Bond.

Bennett reviewed the Proposition 4 requirement for 40% of funds allocated for projects that provide direct benefit to vulnerable populations and disadvantaged communities. CNRA developed a step-by-step assessment process guide for departments to help evaluate projects seeking funding. Proposition 4 provides a number of definitions to help guide this evaluation process, including for Disadvantaged Communities

(DAC), Severely Disadvantaged Communities (SDAC), and Vulnerable populations. California Native American Tribes are considered vulnerable populations within Proposition 4. To ensure “meaningful and direct benefits” will be achieved, CNRA developed four criteria. Meaningful and direct benefits must:

- Ensure the creation of direct, tangible, and substantial benefits
- Protect or enhance a SDAC or vulnerable population’s resources and quality of life by building climate resilience, protecting resources threatened by climate change, or creating/enhancing community and population assets
- Directly respond to the SDAC’s or vulnerable population’s expressed needs
- Do not result in long-term degradation or reduction of SDAC or vulnerable population’s resources

Discussion

Edwards led a discussion session with TAC members on the Proposition 4 presentation. The input and questions received are as follows; chair/staff responses are provided below as sub-bullets:

- Martinez asked if the weatherization program is funded under Proposition 4, and if money is available now. Some state agency representatives have said the money was previously appropriated, but communities are unable to access it.
 - Bennett and Alvis responded that the Low Income Weatherization Program is managed by the California Health and Human Services (CalHHS) Agency and will follow up with CalHHS staff for more information.
- Wentworth asked if the Proposition 4 definitions for DAC, SDAC, and vulnerable communities align with other existing state definitions.
 - Bennett responded the Proposition 4 definitions are different from the definitions for the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund and allows for more granular investigation of local community needs compared to statewide average. In some cases, a county may have high income averages, but small communities within that county may have DAC and SDAC needs.
- Wentworth asked if rural communities with wildfire risk could be excluded from the definitions if they don’t fit into census block definitions.
 - Bennett noted that unincorporated areas should be represented in DAC and SDAC definitions, but additional follow-up may be needed. The vulnerable populations definition is written more broadly.
- David Loya asked if technical assistance is available to DAC, SDAC and vulnerable populations to increase the likelihood of receiving Proposition 4 funding.
 - Alvis and Bennett noted CNRA has provided departmental guidance encouraging all bond programs include technical assistance capabilities.
- Parfrey said the Ocean Protection Council has a good model for technical assistance that may be useful as Proposition 4 money is rolled out.

Vulnerable Communities Platform Use Cases

Ankitha Doddanari, LCI, provided an overview of the Vulnerable Communities Platform (VCP) use cases. The VCP was launched in October, 2025. The VCP seeks to answer three primary questions:

- Where will different climate hazards be the most severe?
- Which communities are most vulnerable?
- What makes those communities vulnerable?

Although the VCP is expected to be useful for all community members, the three use cases discussed included state/regional agencies, local/Tribal governments, and community-based organizations. The VCP will benefit state/regional program administrators identify specific climate vulnerabilities in their geographic areas of interest and efforts such as the 40% set aside in Proposition 4 funding for DAC, SDAC, and vulnerable populations. Local governments can benefit from the VCP by using it to analyze data to fulfill adaptation planning requirements for SB 379 and SB 1035 and assist with hazard and resilience planning. Community-based organizations can use it to help share stories of where and why specific areas are vulnerable to climate change hazards. Following the VCP overview, Doddanari provided a demonstration of the VCP tool, available at <https://vcp.lci.ca.gov/>.

Discussion

Edwards led a discussion session with TAC members on the VCP presentation. The input and questions received are as follows; chair/staff responses are provided below as sub-bullets:

- Denise Kadara asked if any rural communities are participating in the VCP Climate Ready Cohort.
 - Doddanari responded that the Cohort participants were split roughly 50/50 between urban/rural communities.
- Kadara noted that many communities may be experiencing climate threats such as extreme heat, but may not have the ability to connect with VCP staff to help address the challenges they face.
 - Doddanari responded the Climate Ready Cohort is intended to provide minimal barriers to entry to get the information these communities need and connect them with resources needed to address their issues.
- Kim Clark commented a benefit of the VCP is the ability for local communities to tell their story and visualize the specific climate challenges they may face.
- Torres asked where data for the VCP will be housed and how regularly it will be updated.
 - Doddanari responded much of the data used for the VCP comes from the American Community Survey, which is updated on an annual basis but how regularly to update the data in the VCP is still being discussed internally.

2025 ICARP Impact Report

Edwards led a discussion and TAC approval of the 2025 ICARP Impact Report. The Report was developed in 2025 and shared with TAC members at the beginning of February 2026. All edits were incorporated into the current draft. Additional minor modifications - deleting reference to a Tribal roundtable in October 2025 and correcting agency names - were also made.

Discussion

Edwards led a discussion session with TAC members on the 2025 Impact Report. The input and questions received are as follows; chair/staff responses are provided below as sub-bullets:

- Parfrey suggested a cover letter could be included to highlight the importance of the TAC and its work for a Legislative audience (similar to an executive summary).

Public Comment

None

Linda Helland made a motion to approve the 2025 ICARP Impact Report. Clark seconded. With 17 ayes, 0 notes, and 2 abstentions, the Report was approved.

Aye: Abby Edwards, Jacob Alvarez, Patrick Moore, Kim Clark, Alex Ghenis, Jen Phillips, Sarah Izant, Virginia Jameson, Denise Kadara, David Loya, Molly Oshun, Nayamin Martinez, Robyn Fennig, Jonathan Parfrey, Linda Helland, Robert Carlos Torres, Claire Winterton

No: None.

Abstain: Julia Kingsley, John Wentworth

LUNCH BREAK

Adaptation Planning Grant Program Showcase

Sarah Samdin, LCI, provided an overview of the Adaptation Planning Grant Program (APGP), authorized in the 2021 State Climate Budget. APGP is one of three grant programs managed by ICARP along with the Regional Resilience Grant Program and the Extreme Heat and Community Resilience Grant Program.

Round 1 of APGP awards totaled \$8 million across 14 climate adaptation planning projects ranging from \$150,000 to \$650,000. Round 2 sought a continued \$9.5 million investment in APGP but was cancelled in 2024 due to State budget constraints.

Grants from APGP provided critical funding to support climate adaptation and resilience statewide, and prioritized investments in vulnerable communities. It also enabled communities to meet local and state planning requirements while better positioning them to pursue additional opportunities from federal and philanthropic funders. ICARP staff will work to highlight the impact of the APGP through storytelling throughout 2026. Key outcomes from the APGP included:

- Outreach and engagement to nearly 20,000 community members at over 600 events in 8 languages by grantees;
- 14 new or updated Climate Adaptation and Resilience Plans/Strategies;
- 4 new or updated General Plan elements;
- Plans developed with APGP support addressed key topics such as wildfire, environmental justice, air quality, extreme heat, flooding, evacuation, seismic hazards, and more.

Following the overview from Samdin, individual grantees from three efforts provided case study reports to the TAC including:

- Ramona Barona Climate Adaptation and Resilience Plan
- Shade Equity Master Plan for Unincorporated Eastern Coachella Valley
- San Rafael Climate Adaptation Planning Collaborative

Erica Wolski, Ramona Municipal Water District, and Hannah Mize, Rincon Consultants, provided an overview of the Ramona Barona Climate Adaptation and Resilience Plan (Plan). Ramona and Barona in central San Diego County are bordered by desert and mountainous areas. The climate is generally hotter and drier than coastal areas, and faces significant wildfire threats. The Plan area covers roughly 40,000 residents and includes the Barona and Mesa Grande Tribes. The Barona Band of Mission Indians was the primary project partner in the development of the Plan. As a direct result of the Plan, Barona will be connected to the District

for both drinking and recycled water. Collaboration with an array of regional partners was critical for the success of the planning effort, and demonstrated that this type of Plan can be developed in conservative areas.

Mize provided a technical overview of the Plan. Development of the Plan included a two-step process including background technical analysis of the physical and social environment and calibration of this understanding through community engagement to ensure Plan assumptions aligned with community lived experience. Outreach was conducted through in person visit to community events, direct discussion with Tribes in the region, and innovative demonstrations of VR technology at town halls and workshops.

Christian Rodriguez Ceja, Kounkuey Design Initiative, provided an overview of the Easter Coachella Valley (ECV) Shade Equity Master Plan (Master Plan). The ECV is a rural, agricultural hub in southern California and includes the towns of Thermal , Oasis, Mecca, and North Shore. Combined, the ECV has roughly half the population of the City of Palm Springs. ECV faces numerous climate challenges including extreme heat, air quality issues, and poor drinking water quality. It also includes virtually no parks and very few shaded areas. Work associated with the Master Plan effort began in 2013 with the development of a shade refuge in North Shore. This led to discussions around a regional mobility plan for other ECV communities to create shaded areas near public transit so people wouldn't need to wait for buses in 110+ degree heat. After the development of prototype shade structures for transit stops, the ECV pursued funding for development of the Master Plan. Development of the Master Plan was heavily reliant on the development of partnerships with communities in the region and direct public outreach to over 400 residents. Raids by US Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) forced a modification of the outreach approach and the Master Plan team began meeting people in their homes and at trusted community locations such as churches. In total, over 34 workshops were held at a variety of locations. Key guidelines from the Master Plan include:

- Creating microclimates
- Shading desired spaces
- Ensure the right shade in the in the right place
- Phasing shade development
- Creating shade corridors
- Creating shade beacons
- Creating multi-functional shaded areas

Funding from the APGP has allowed the Master Plan team to build the capacity needed to directly involve community members to mitigate extreme heat impacts. It also helped position the ECV to receive a \$250,000 investment from Riverside County for Master Plan implementation.

Kate Hagemann, City of San Rafael, provided an overview of the San Rafael Climate Adaptation Planning Collaborative (Planning Collaborative). San Rafael faces significant threats from sea level rise and many low-lying areas experienced inundation from king tide events in early 2026. In many low-income areas, structures were built before the implementation of the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) and sit behind seawalls and levees but below flood levels. Much of the shoreline in San Rafael is privately owned, exacerbating flood resilience efforts such as seawall and levee construction. The Planning Collaborative launched with funding from the APGP to educate community members on flood risk and receive feedback on a variety of flooding scenarios and adaptation alternatives. This outreach helped articulate community priorities in light of increased risks from flooding and climate change.

Discussion

Edwards led a discussion session with TAC members on the APGP presentation and grantee case studies. The input and questions received are as follows; chair/staff responses are provided below as sub-bullets:

- Kadara stressed the importance of partnering with Tribal communities and governments at all phases of planning and project implementation.
- Sarah Izant highlighted the outreach conducted by all of the case study teams, and reinforced the need for sustained, meaningful engagement with communities to ensure their voices are reflected in planning efforts.
- Clark asked how the various project teams were able to use APGP grants to launch funding efforts with other organizations.
 - Wolski noted that the grant application process for APGP helped educate the team on the grant writing process and encouraged them to apply to other programs. Mize added that having new partnership development as a specific part of the grant award helped encourage all project partners to look for other funding opportunities.
- Molly Oshun asked whether outreach for the Planning Collaborative included discussions on the potential need for managed retreat.
 - Hagemann noted San Rafael is one of the most heavily segregated communities in the Bay Area and does not have programs to support people to move with dignity by choice. As a result, managed retreat was not looked at as one of the Planning Collaborative strategies.
- Jenn Phillips suggested the APGP should highlight how these case studies can help similar efforts move from planning to implementation. Storytelling can show how progress is achieved, but also help initiate conversations with other programs and connect to layered funding opportunities.
- Loya appreciated Planning Collaborative at looking at multiple alternatives and the challenges with nature based solutions.

SB 254 Natural Catastrophe Resiliency Study (Study) Overview

Tom Welsh, California Earthquake Authority (CEA), provided an overview of CEA history and natural catastrophe insurance funds. Following the successful development of the CEA as an earthquake relief insurance fund, Governor Newsom asked CEA leadership to develop a similar program for wildfire insurance. A \$21 billion Wildfire Fund was quickly developed as a result.

Following the LA fires in 2025, it was quickly apparent that the Wildfire Fund would be tapped out. As a result, the Legislature passed and the Governor signed SB 254 to establish a continuation account within the Wildfire Fund for payment of claims on or after September 2025 and added a \$18 billion claim-paying capacity through charges to utility ratepayers. It also authorized the California Department of Water Resources to issue \$10 billion in bond to support the account. Knowing these funds were not immediately available and could be exceeded in the event of another large disaster such as the LA fires, a comprehensive study was launched to provide specific recommendations for the creation and management of a sustainable wildfire recovery fund. The Study is due to the Legislature and Governor on or before April 1, 2026. Additional information on the Wildfire Fund is available online at www.cawildfirefund.com.

Following the overview from Welsh, Lori Johnson provided an overview of the Study. The Study is a collaborative effort between a range of State agencies, ratepayer advocates, utility companies, the insurance industry, and claimant attorneys; it's overarching goal is to develop recommendations to accelerate recovery for survivors of natural catastrophes and more equitably distribute allocate recovery costs across all impacted organization, industries, and victims while mitigating damage from future disasters. A total of 10 directives were included in SB 254, including the development of recommendations for:

- Accessibility and affordability of property insurance
- Evaluation of alternative structures to social risk to catastrophic damage

- Additional mitigation measures and technological solutions
- Financing, insurance, and other mechanisms to expedite recovery
- Additional measures to benefit ratepayers
- Options for enactment of streamlined, low-cost mechanisms to provide injured parties with full compensation for wildfire damages
- Analysis of potential benefits and negative impacts related to reasonable limitation on changes to recoveries in wildfire litigation
- Options for the enactment of programs to reduce risk of wildfire
- Options for reducing economic damage from wildfires
- Options for new models to complement or replace the Wildfire Fund

Through SB 254 outreach, stakeholders stressed the need for catastrophe mitigation before disasters occur. Other key areas of consensus include the need to improve data and modeling and address affordability and equity, as wildfire costs disproportionately impact low-income and vulnerable households. Key areas of disagreement include inverse condemnation, limitations on damages and attorney’s fees, and the role of government and cost socialization (i.e., great cost socialization vs. private market mechanisms).

Discussion

Edwards led a discussion session with TAC members on the SB 254 presentation. The input and questions received are as follows; chair/staff responses are provided below as sub-bullets:

- Martinez asked for more information on preliminary workforce development recommendations in the Study.
 - Johnson responded stakeholders pointed out that we don’t have the expertise necessary to mitigate wildfire risk in California. This requires both workforce training to assist with home hardening activities as well as supply chain improvements to provide materials for these types of projects.
- Parfrey asked how the Study group considered mitigation as a means to increase affordability for homeowners, ratepayers and industry groups.
 - Welsh acknowledged there is a tension between some state priorities such as increasing housing density and wildfire. Higher density areas are at increased risk for urban conflagration, but more housing stock is needed to reduce the overall cost of homeownership. Ultimately, the long-term solution to bring down consumer and industry costs is reducing the risk of urban conflagration through pre-disaster mitigation efforts.
- Phillips asked if the Study stakeholders looked at other climate change impacts such as sea level rise and drought.
 - Johnson acknowledged that given the short timeline for completion of the Study, wildfire received the most emphasis. Since the group was focused on financial systems and not specific wildfire mitigation strategies, the recommendations can be applied to other disasters as well.

State Extreme Heat Action Plan

Phillips and Catherine Foster, LCI, provided an update on the California Extreme Heat Action Plan (Action Plan). The Action Plan was released for public review in February 2026; the comment period is open through early April with a final draft expected on or before July 1, 2026. The Action Plan is organized around four tracks: public awareness, community services/response, the built environment, and nature-based solutions.

Together, these four tracks represent and all of government approach on how the State is addressing extreme heat currently and where we hope to go in the future to build further resilience. CNRA and LCI have conducted extensive outreach throughout the process to develop the draft currently out for public review. Moving forward, the Action Plan will be updated every three years.

Following the presentation, Phillips and Foster provided four questions for TAC guidance:

1. How can we best engage the public on the 2026 Action Plan?
2. How can the 2026 Action Plan better support extreme heat engagement and coordination among state agencies?
3. How can we make the 2026 Action Plan more accessible and relevant to local practitioners and community members?
4. How do we effectively integrate additional items into the Action Plan such as case studies, reflections on progress, and next steps?

Discussion

Edwards led a discussion session with TAC members on the Action Plan presentation. The input and questions received are as follows; chair/staff responses are provided below as sub-bullets:

- Parfrey asked if a timeline can be sent to TAC members in the meeting Packet.
 - Phillips and Foster offered to send the timeline from the slide deck.
- Wentworth asked how human migration due to extreme heat impacts is addressed in the Action Plan.
 - Phillips responded human migration is not reflected in the Action Plan at this time. Instead, the Action Plan focuses on what can be done currently to address extreme heat impacts. This issue can be addressed in fifth Climate Change Assessment, a long-range planning effort.
- Martinez requested real-time interpretation for Action Plan workshops and meetings, as many of the areas facing the greatest heat challenges are predominantly Spanish-speaking. Martinez also requested a longer public comment period to adequately brief the communities most impacted by extreme heat. Finally, Martinez recommended a short summary, insert, or guide be included in the Action Plan to more easily explain the recommendations and actions to diverse audiences.
 - Phillips noted the timeline for completing this iteration of the Action Plan is fairly short, but for future plans the team would like to incorporate longer timelines. Foster added that how information is disseminated and making it accessible to all audiences will be a major focus in the future.
- Ghenis noted persons with disabilities experience acute affects of extreme heat and encouraged targeted collaboration with disability organizations. Ghenis also noted that digital engagement is important to aid in this collaboration. All documents and outreach should be Section 508 compliant, and any images related to people with disabilities should be genuine representations and not stock photos.

Goals and Priorities for 2026

Edwards led a discussion of TAC priorities for 2026. In 2025, the TAC developed four priorities: cultivate trust and empower communities; showcase impact through storytelling; expand localized data, research and tools; and implement innovative adaptation and resilience action. The TAC also updated its charter and amended its definition of vulnerable communities in the context of climate change. For 2026, Edwards asked TAC members to consider three questions:

1. What do you hope the TAC will achieve in 2026?
2. Who/What should be uplifted through TAC meetings and products?

3. Where do you envision the TAC being in 5 years?

TAC members were given sticky notes and an opportunity to provide thoughts on each question. The results are provided for each question below:

1. What do you hope the TAC will achieve in 2026?

- More deliberation and recommendations that influence grants, technical assistance, policy and legislation to advance the ICARP mission
- The 2025 goals are still relevant
- Communities are using the VCP!
- Develop a vision for after the midterm elections and after a change in federal administration
- Put resilience front and center for the next generation
- Key climate adaptation and mitigation efforts will be completed in 2026 such as EHAP, CAPG, and the 5th Climate Assessment. The TAC can serve as a means to integrate those elements into work on the ground whether by spreading the word about resources or informing their outreach/roll-out
- Relationship building and networks of solidarity in beleaguered times
- Identify concrete ways the state will help fill the funding gap left by the federal government
- Hold more meetings in communities to hear from residents and offer that the TAC is here to help offer solutions
- The Resilient California Summit is a game changer
- Serve as a venue to talk through adaptation policy frameworks and identify gaps where additional state direction would be helpful
- Share ideas and leadership beyond California
- Engage wider public in climate action
- Adding clarity for local governments about which tool and which resource for what
- Learn about ways state agencies are coordinating on climate adaptation and resilience efforts
- Elevate heat and a strategy for heat for the next administration
- Prioritize support for communities and local partners with little to no funding
- Establish recommendations that support and guide beyond the current California administration
- Lay out a strong statewide vision for achieving climate resilience for all impacts, sectors, and people
- Highlight success stories of the APGP to build the case for additional funding
- Would love to walk away with an idea of funding stacks. How can we fund adaptation sustainably?
- Identify and clearly direct communities to resilience funding opportunities
- Support the update of the APGP
- More presentations on research on adaptation measures; less on grant program guidelines (or none)
- More case studies
- For general information items like Proposition 4, make those optional webinars instead of agendaized information items
- Provide oversight and recommendations for successful rollout of climate initiatives such as Proposition 4, VCP, and the 5th Climate Assessment
- Economic analysis related to cost-savings associated with resilience investments. Local governments need this information to pass revenue measures

2. Who/What should be uplifted through TAC meetings and products:

- Continue to support vulnerable and traditionally marginalized communities and populations
- Provide more narratives and success stories
- Resilience success stories and where we can fill gaps
- Insurers and reinsurers
- Community voices
- Local governments, CBOs, and Tribes implementing adaptation projects to show their needs and provide responsive support at the state level
- Uplift actions and struggles faced by DACs and environmental justice communities across the state
- Local governments that have used state resources or those who haven't and for what reason
- Underserved communities and climate leaders
- Best in class climate storytelling
- More Indigenous voices
- Examples of climate change projects that improve communities and products that help improve results
- Current local government efforts and projects with creative solutions
- Local jurisdictions with CBO partnerships
- Effective application of state data/modeling tools and/or critiques
- Joy, solidarity and resilience
- Coordination between utilities and climate projects to spread costs
- Voices of vulnerable communities that we haven't support yet to learn obstacles to access, funding, and potential solutions
- All Californians and sectors should be uplifted through TAC experiences and leadership in the new climate
- We started hearing more discussion of Tribal governments and communities; it would be great to have them uplifted through site visits or direct engagement with the TAC

3. Where do you envision the TAC in 5 years?

- Thought leader pushing innovation
- In a nicer conference room
- We will be doing best practices work on the initiatives and projects underway now
- Other states are clearly following the lead of this TAC
- Effective body for vetting state-led initiatives on technology, adaptation, data use, and modeling
- TAC is a locus of information about adaptation strategies
- Newest research and pilot project information shared here
- Forum for discussion of challenges
- Reviewing all state investments for maladaptation
- Discuss and evaluate on the ground projects more than just planning
- We will have accessible, interactive storytelling materials that uplift a variety of California communities
- National replication of initiatives
- Meaningful oversight of private sector advancements in climate planning being used by the California Department of Water Resources (DWR), CNRA, CARB, etc.
- Engaged with vulnerable communities and worked to identify solutions
- Identify some plan of action for moving forward
- Add value by increasing the impact of state and local efforts
- The TAC will be in a warm status because funding to state climate programs has been restored by the federal government
- Local agencies will have more direct involvement
- Stay on the cutting edge of adaptation and resilience to ensure we're maximizing opportunities to adapt to climate change
- Effectively establish norms for climate scenario selection and assess time-bound risk for resilient adaptive management

- A stronger advisory group that could advocate for more funding for climate investment and programs
- A new name or brand that people understand and feel welcome being part of
- A recognized council with political and public attention (i.e., more of a decision making and voting body)

Discussion

Following the priorities exercise discussed above, Edwards led a discussion to develop a report summarizing TAC discussions on adaptation funding and finance. To aid in the development of this report, the TAC could establish a subcommittee to review and write sections as needed. Edwards noted establishing a subcommittee constitutes a voting item by the TAC. Specific membership on the subcommittee would be coordinated between meetings. The input and questions received are as follows; chair/staff responses are provided below as sub-bullets:

- Clark supported the concept of a report and a subcommittee to help understand what’s happening at the state level and see what community based organizations are doing in the climate resilience space.
- Parfrey endorsed the concept of a subcommittee and pursuing funding/financing strategies, and noted the TAC is unique in that it has both state and local agencies as well as community-based organizations.
- Wentworth echoed support for establishing a subcommittee, and commented the TAC can help coordinate adaptation finance discussions at multiple levels. It provides an opportunity to hear from a variety of organizations and agencies and can help guide effective implementation of climate programs such as the rollout of Proposition 4.

Public Comment

None

Clark made a motion to approve the formation of a TAC subcommittee. Kadara seconded. With 18 ayes, 0 notes, and 2 abstentions, the Report was approved.

Aye: Abby Edwards, Patrick Moore, Kim Clark, Alex Ghenis, Molly Oshun, Jen Phillips, Sarah Izant, Virginia Jameson, Denise Kadara, David Loya, Molly Oshun, Nayamin Martinez, Jalen Tran (on behalf of Julia Kingsley), Jonathan Parfrey, Linda Helland, Robert Carlos Torres, Claire Winterton, John Wentworth

No: None.

Abstain: Jacob Alvarez, Robyn Fennig

General Public Comment

Magill led general public comment for all items not on the agenda. Comments received are reported below:

- Michael McCormick, Farallon Strategies highlighted a report developed by Farallon Strategies on coastal monitoring in partnership with the Resilient Cities Catalyst as part of the California Coastal Accelerator Cohort. The need for consistent coastal monitoring across jurisdictional boundaries to better inform decision making was raised by multiple coastal communities from Fort Bragg to

Oceanside. Although data collection happens across the state, it is often inconsistent without dedicated resources really to analyze data at scale. In the past, the federal government has supported coastal monitoring, but federal funding may be inconsistent in the future. Moreover, the operations/maintenance for data collection and analysis, governance and data management has not been addressed. To address these and other issues, the report provides six actions:

- Treat coastal monitoring as core infrastructure to inform good policies and decisions.
- Fund data analysis, not just collection.
- Define statewide unifying standards.
- Invest in monitoring aligned with natural systems at regional scale.
- Support rural, tribal, and capacity-limited communities.

The report recommends completing these actions through a California Coastal Monitoring Initiative, a joint initiative of local governments, state agencies, and other partners. The report will be sent to ICARP staff for distribution to the TAC, and report partners are happy to members as needed.

AJOURN